

I-710 EIR/EIS PROJECT COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 29, 2010
6:30 PM Meeting

Progress Park
15500 Downey Avenue
Paramount, CA

AGENDA

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL – BY SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. **AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** – This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s)
- V. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** - Three minutes for each speaker.
- VI. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** of the January 28, 2010, meeting of the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee
- VII. **REPORTS**
 - A. Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) – Presentation by ICF, Scott Broen
SUGGESTED ACTION: Received and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff
 - B. Zero Emission Vehicles Implementation Study – Presentation by CALSTART, Michael Ippoliti
SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff
 - C. I-710 Urban Design Concepts – Presentation by Gruen Associates, Elaine Carbrey
SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff



Metro



D. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Engineering Report By URS, Jack Waldron

SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff.

E. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Environmental Report by LSA, Rob McCann

SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff.

F. I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Community Participation Report by MIG, Pat McLaughlin

SUGGESTED ACTION: Receive and File Report and/or Give Direction to Staff.

G. I-710 Corridor Project Changes and Revision to Scope of Work - Presentation by MTA, Doug Failing

SUGGESTED ACTION:

1. Receive and File Status Reports;
2. Concur with I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendations for modification of scope of work and schedule and associated budget modifications;
3. Forward to the Executive Committee for concurrence and recommendation to MTA Board of Directors to modify the consultant contracts accordingly.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

IX. ADJOURNMENT



Metro



VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

Item A

Approval of Minutes
January 28, 2010

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE I-710 CORRIDOR PROJECT EIR/EIS
PROJECT COMMITTEE**

**A Meeting Held at the Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Blvd.
Paramount, CA**

January 28, 2010

I. Call to Order

Co-Chairman Hurtado called the meeting to order at 6:38 PM.

II. Roll Call

Roll Call was taken by Self-Introductions

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate, Sergio Infanzon, City of Bell Gardens; Co-Chair; Hugo Argumedo, City of Commerce; Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy; Anne Bayer, City of Downey; Andy Molina, City of Huntington Park; Val Lerch, City of Long Beach; Ana Rosa Rizo, City of Maywood; Gene Daniels, City of Paramount; Larry Forester, City of Signal Hill; William Davis, City of Vernon; Phil Doudar, County of Los Angeles; Dr. Mike Walter, Port of Long Beach; Borja Leon, Port of Los Angeles; Joe Aguilar, I-5 JPA; Rick Land, Caltrans; Karen Heit, MTA; Susan Seamans, SBCCOG.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: George Mirabal, City of Bell; Jim Dear, City of Carson; Lillie Dobson, City of Compton; Maria T. Santillan, City of Lynwood; Rich Macias, SCAG; Barbara Messina, SGVCOG.

ALSO PRESENT: California Secretary of Business, Transportation, and Housing Dale Bonner; South Gate Councilmember Bill DeWitt; Bill Pagett, City Engineer, City of Paramount and City of Maywood, I-710 TAC Chair; Barbara Munoz, Director of Public Works, City of Signal Hill; Ron Kosinski, Caltrans; Garrett Damrath, Caltrans; Ernesto Chavez, Transportation Planner, Metro; Devon Cichoski, Metro; Roger Moliere, Metro; Susan Nakamura, South Coast Air Quality Management District; Richard Powers, Executive Director, GCCOG; Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director, GCCOG; Jerry Wood, GCCOG Engineer; Jack Waldron, Project Manager, URS; Dave Levinsohn, Deputy Project Manager, URS; Shannon Willits, Engineering Manager, URS; Rob McCann, President, LSA; Jayna Goodman, Senior Planner, LSA; Pat McLaughlin, Principal, MIG; Esmeralda Garcia, Project Manager, MIG; Julia Lester, Environ International; Nancy Pfeffer, President,

Network Public Affairs; Karl Rodenbaugh, The Planning Center; Bill Van Amburg, Senior Vice President, CALSTART; Lan Saadatnejadi, HDR.

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Member Gurule led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. Amendments to the Agenda

There were no amendments to the agenda.

V. Public Comments

Aileen Ramos, Commerce resident, said she supports the East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice.

Nathan Mata, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, said he wants what is best for his community.

Andrea Hricko, USC Keck School of Public Health, said she is concerned about the lack of public participation.

Briana Pasillas, Commerce resident, said she wants the pollution to leave and that she supports East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice.

Isella Ramirez, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, read a letter that urged that the Health Impact Statement be included as part of the EIR/EIS.

Candido Casillas, Communities for a Better Environment, said he is here to get more information and is concerned about the noise from the freeway.

Mark Lopez, Communities for a Better Environment, said he is concerned that information about the project is not getting out.

Sonny Roque, East Los Angeles resident, said that he supports East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice.

VI. Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Member Lerch, to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 29, 2009. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. Comments by Dale Bonner, Secretary of the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency of the State of California

California Business, Transportation, and Housing Secretary Dale Bonner addressed the Project Committee regarding the importance of the I-710 project to the State. He said the two San Pedro Bay ports are the main economic engines, but are also a source of the environmental problems. He said he knows people are dedicated to working on the solution.

Secretary Bonner said the state is looking at a public/private partnership to advance the project. He said \$6 billion is a very big project, equal to what the State of California spends annually throughout the state on transportation. He said the State wants to work with the Project Committee now to get closer to the project so that the State can help market the project throughout the world.

Secretary Bonner concluded by saying that the State is aware of the good that has been done here and that the State will insert itself to help move the project along. He said he hope the Project Committee will account for a lifetime of maintenance. He said he realizes how long a process like this takes.

VIII. Reports

A. Metro Presentation on Public/Private Funding Project Study for I-710

Roger Moliere addressed the Project Committee on Metro's study of a potential public/private funding strategy for the I-710 project. He said tax dollars will not be sufficient to deliver the project in a timely manner. Therefore, Metro is looking for potential additional dollars through private sources. He briefly described the respective roles and responsibilities of the public and private partners in such a relationship. He said MTA has retained a program management and advisory consulting team to perform this study.

It was moved by Member Gurule, seconded by Member Davis, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. Zero Emission Vehicles Presentation by CALSTART

Bill Van Amburg, Senior Vice President of CALSTART, gave a power point presentation on the state of the industry for zero emission trucks and vehicles and some ideas for incorporating those vehicles into the I-710 Freight Corridor. He said the technology is viable if there is a sustained effort to build marketability. He said there are real implications for the I-710 freeway.

Co-Chairman Hurtado asked what is meant by “zero emissions”. Mr. Van Amburg responded that it means no emissions at all out of the vehicle itself. However, at some point there will be emissions from the electrical generation source; but the reduction of emissions overall is significant.

It was moved by Member Forrester, seconded by Member Daniels, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. I-710 Construction Staging Presentation

Jack Waldron, URS, gave a power point presentation on the results of the construction staging concepts studies prepared for the I-710 project. This analysis showed that it is possible to construct six segments of the I-710 project simultaneously over about an eight year period and could be considered as a construction phasing concept for the project. However, any construction phasing was a function of funding and would be considered speculative. .

Mr. Waldron presented the following timeline for the project:

- 2015/2016 complete design
- 2016/2019 property acquisition/utility relocations/right-of-way certification completed
- 2020/2029 construction years (all six segments under construction at one time)

Mr. Waldron then summarized the recommendations of the I-710 Technical Advisory Committee:

1. Concur with the project team that all six segments could be built simultaneously;
2. Find that this represents the “worst case scenario” for analyzing the air quality impacts from construction of the project;
3. Find that this construction would take place in an eight year period and that the project schedule is reasonable;
4. Find that the I-710 EIR/EIS will quantify the total construction emissions, but will not include AQ/HRA dispersion modeling of construction activities;
5. Find that the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) will provide for the additional analysis of construction related air quality health impacts for a “highest impact scenario” (or worst case scenario stated above) of all segments under construction in the years 2022 to 2025 along with a “more likely construction phasing scenario” (presumably 16 years total) and provide this as input into the I-710 EIR/EIS process; and
6. Concur that the results should be used in the I-710 Corridor Project Draft EIR/EIS.

It was moved by Member Gurule, seconded by Member Forester, to receive and file the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Susan Nakamura, South Coast Air Quality Management District, said she was concerned that the EIR will not include the health effects of construction in the Health Risk Assessment.

It was moved by Member Walter, seconded by Member Leon, to concur with the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee and to include a Health Risk Assessment as part of recommendation number four. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. I-710 Community Advisory Committee Recommendation Continued from the Project Committee Meeting of October 29, 2009

Rob McCann, LSA, summarized the actions taken at the October 29, 2009, meeting of the Project Committee. He said that the Project Committee had approved the use of the SCAQMD thresholds within the CEQA Significance Thresholds, had continued the Near Source Modeling and Construction Impacts Analysis, and approved the Health Impact Assessment for inclusion in the Air Quality Action Plan.

Julia Lester, Environ, provided clarification on the Near Source Modeling and discussed the technical limitations on the accuracy and validity of model results within 125 meters of the freeway. She said the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Committee was that the results of the review and analysis in the AQAP be reported to the Project Committee and used in the I-710 Corridor Draft EIR/EIS.

Julia Lester described the Construction Impact Analysis and how the Air Quality/Health Risk Assessment will qualitatively discuss construction staging. However, she said, without detailed projections of construction activity and timing, calculating detailed emissions and performing a full AQ/HRA modeling and dispersion analysis is not technically feasible. She said the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Committee is that the results of this qualitative analysis in the AQAP be presented to the Project Committee and used in the I-710 Corridor Draft EIR/EIS.

Jerry Wood discussed the relationship of the Air Quality Action Plan to the I-710 EIR/EIS. He said the AQAP will address air quality and health concerns of the Gateway Cities subregion as a whole, but that it can help define desired air quality and health outcomes related to the I-710 and other projects. He said the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Community Advisory Committee is that the analyses and results of the AQAP be used in the I-710 Corridor Draft EIR/EIS.

David Martinez, South Gate resident, said he is concerned about pollution when running along the Los Angeles River. He said 16 lanes on the freeway would increase pollution. Jose Neri, South Gate resident, said he is concerned about the health effects of the freeway.

Andrea Hricko, USC Keck School of Public Health, said her main priority is the health impacts of being near highways and freeways. She said she has been asking that the Health Impact Assessment be part of the draft EIR/EIS.

Jocelyn Vivar, East Yards Communities for Environmental Justice, thanked the Project Committee for agreeing that there should be a Health Impact Assessment. She asked the Project Committee to revisit the issue and place the Health Impact Assessment in the EIR/EIS. She said she is confused by what linking the AQAP and EIR means.

Alan Porfirio, Communities for a Better Environment, said he breathes this air every day and want the Project Committee to consider the children that will be born in this area in the future.

Robert Cabrales, Communities for a Better Environment, shared a report prepared by his organization on cumulative impacts. He said his organization wants the Health Impact Assessment as part of the EIR/EIS.

Carolina Cabrera, Communities for a Better Environment, said she is worried that nothing will be done that will actually clean the air.

Elina Nasser, UCLA School of Public Health, said she is concerned that near source modeling and construction impacts are now recommended to be in the AQAP and not the EIR/EIS.

Beatriz Reyes, Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma, said she wants better outreach strategies and a demonstration of alternative technologies. Maria Reyes, Long Beach resident, said she is concerned about air quality and feels it is important to involve the community.

Elena Rodriguez, Long Beach resident, said it is very important, first, to continue with the Air Quality Action Plan. She said every meeting of the Project Committee should have a follow-up report to the community. She said public participation should be a priority.

Ian McMillan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, said a big problem with the AQAP is that it is a huge project and the timeline is long and won't be completed before the EIR/EIS.

Richard Ivey said that port expansion needs to be accomplished by near dock rail.

Julia Lester, Environ, said the EIR/EIS and AQAP are two different types of analysis. The EIR examines the project. She said we don't have the information at the level needed to include construction impacts in the EIR.

Jerry Wood said the AQAP will take about a year to complete. He said they are working hard to complete it at the same time as the EIR/EIS.

Member Rizo thanked Co-Chairman Hurtado for making it clear that the health of our residents is our priority. She said she is concerned that the Slauson interchange is still part of the project.

It was moved by Member Rizo, seconded by Member Lerch, to concur with the recommendations of the Community Advisory Committee and to include the Health Impact Assessment as part of the EIR/EIS.

Member Forester said it is too speculative to include the Health Impact Assessment in the EIR/EIS. He said it does not structurally belong there. He said there are too many "what ifs". Also, to say that nothing has been done ignores the ports' Clean Truck Program, which has been phenomenal.

Member Daniels asked how far away from the freeway the receptors would be. Julia Lester responded that they would be about 300 feet away.

Member Daniels said people are not aware of programs such as the Gateway Cities Clean Air Program.

Member Lerch said even if the Health Impact Assessment slows down the project by six or seven months we should still do it.

Rob McCann, LSA, said about 80% of the Health Impact Assessment will be included in the EIR/EIS; the other 20% is not related to the I-710 project and should not be included in an EIR, which is project specific.

Member Walter described the various projects at the two ports which have already significantly reduced pollution.

Member Aguilar said the perception by the local advisory committees that we are ignoring them is bothersome.

Member Seamans asked that the difference between a Health Risk Assessment and a Health Impact Assessment be clarified. Julia Lester, Environ, responded that a Health Risk Assessment is a formal, calculation procedure that looks at modeling and calculates concentrations of toxics

and for air quality what the chances for cancer are. She said this is what is in the EIR. Jerry Wood explained that the Health Impact Assessment tries to tie different health impact pathways together, including noise and air pollution, and then prioritize.

Member Infanzon said the problem is that some the subject matter is very technical and difficult to understand by the public.

Ron Kosinski, Caltrans, said the environmental analysis for this project already exceeds what Caltrans normally does. He said the additional analysis from the Health Impact Assessment may not pass muster from the Caltrans attorneys.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Members Infanzon, Argumedo, Gurule, Guerrero, Lerch, Rizo, Davis, Doudar, Aguilar, and Co-Chairman Hurtado.

NOES: Members Bayer, Daniels, Forester, Walter, Leon, Land, and Heit.

ABSENT: Members Mirabal, Dear, Dobson, Santillan, Macias, and Messina.

NOTE VOTING: Member Seamans (ex-officio)

The motion was approved.

Member Seamans requested that an opinion of an attorney be sought as to the legality of the inclusion of the Health Impact Assessment in the EIR.

Member Leon said that in the future it would be helpful to have a CEQA lawyer present.

E. Status Report on I-710 EIR/EIS

Jack Waldron, URS, reviewed the schedule and current and completed tasks of the project.

Dave Levinsohn, URS, reviewed the traffic modeling reports' updated projections. He said the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation was that the higher truck projections be used and that Alternatives 6A and 6B include maximum truck volume lane assumptions, and that, in addition, Alternative 6B also include an additional technology option to increase the truck volumes per lane in the freight corridor for that alternative and address the geometric needs for this option.

Rob McCann, LSA, talked about the stormwater treatment approach in the EIR/EIS. Mr. McCann reviewed the overall status of the environmental studies and the other related studies.

Pat McLaughlin, MIG, reviewed the recent activities of the various advisory committees and subject working groups. She described the CEQA and NEPA outreach process and compared it to the I-710 EIR/EIS process and its greater opportunities for public participation.

Member Forester said that there should be a stormwater action plan.

Member Daniels asked how communities will be notified of open houses. Pat McLaughlin said the process will be similar to the scoping meetings. Devon Cichoski, Metro, said there will be mailings, news releases, postings on the Metro website, email "blasts" to those on the mailing list, and notices on buses and trains. Member Seamans said the local advisory committees can go to their cities because cities have ways to communicate with their residents.

It was moved by Member Daniels, seconded by Member Bayer, to receive and file the status reports and concur with the Technical Advisory Committee recommendations. The motion was approved unanimously.

Member Doudar said he is concerned that the traffic modeling shows service level F in the freight corridor at the north end of the freeway. It was moved by Member Forester, seconded by Co-Chairman Hurtado, to give the task to the Technical Advisory Committee to look at this in conjunction with the MS-4. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Comments from Committee Members

Member Infanzon requested that copies of the PowerPoint presentations be included in future agenda packets.

X. Adjournment

It was moved by Member Lerch, seconded by Member Forester, to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 p.m.

VII. Reports
Item A
Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) –
Presentation by ICF, Scott Broen

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) – Presentation by ICF, Scott Broen

Background

MTA has retained the firm of ICF International to develop the Air Quality Action Plan that the Project Committee has directed to be performed for the Gateway Cities subregion. Representatives of ICF will be making a presentation at tonight's meeting to introduce the project team and to present an overview of the project scope and work schedule to the Project Committee. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is attached.

Attachment

- Power Point presentation.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS

Item B

**Zero Emission Vehicles
Implementation Study - Presentation
by CALSTART, Michael Ippoliti**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: Zero Emission Vehicles Implementation Study - Presentation by CALSTART, Michael Ippoliti

Background

CALSTART is a national, non-profit, member supported organization whose mission is to support and expand the growth of a clean transportation technologies industry that will:

- Create high-quality jobs;
- Clean the air;
- Reduce dependence on foreign oil; and
- Reduce global warming emissions

Working with LACMTA and supported by South Coast AQMD, we have begun the process to commercialize zero-emission freight movement vehicles and supporting infrastructure in the I-710 corridor design.

Moving Freight with Zero Emissions can be achieved. Hybrid and Zero-Emissions Heavy Trucks are a reality, with Kenworth, Peterbilt, Navistar, Freightliner, Balqon and others have partial or total zero emissions trucks.

The project goal is to validate and commercialize market-sustainable, zero-emission goods movement vehicles, including the necessary supporting infrastructure. The design is for the I-710 freight corridor, but the intention is for additional uses statewide and nationwide. This is one of the key benefits of a truck-based solution to zero-emissions goods movement.

We are embarking on a multi-year, coordinated plan; that will look to find aligned investments, R&D, requirements definition, incentives and policies. Both market “pull” and market development are critical. To be successful, there must be both vehicles AND the market to support their use

The key to a successful project will be working at the same time on 3 Parallel Action Paths: **Vehicle, Users, and Corridor**. We therefore are working with the following CALSTART Project Team Structure:

- Three Working Groups (one for each path)
 - Vehicle Users Working Group
 - Vehicle Commercialization Working Group
 - Corridor Commercialization Working Group

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

- Three Advisory Councils
 - Technical Advisory Council
 - Stakeholder Advisory Council
 - Infrastructure Advisory Council
- Additional resources (CalHEAT, monitor groups)

Over the next 4 months, CALSTART will be conducting data Collection on technologies and options and a Barrier Assessment. We will be preparing early “pathway” truck demonstrations, recruiting for the Working Groups and Advisory Councils, plus several other concurrent activities.

Attachment

- Power Point presentation.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS

Item C

**I-710 Urban Design Concepts –
Presentation by Gruen Associates,
Elaine Carbrey**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Urban Design Concepts – Presentation by Gruen Associates, Elaine Carbrey

Background

The I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS project team has been working with members of the corridor communities through the Community Design and Local Economy Subject Working Group (CSWG) to explore aesthetic and urban design enhancements that could be implemented as an element of the project, if a build alternative is selected for implementation. To date, the CSWG, working with consultant team member Gruen Associates, have developed preliminary aesthetic and urban design concepts.

Issue

The CSWG preliminary findings have been presented to the Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for their information and comment. These preliminary findings are being presented to the Project Committee for your information and comment.

Attachment

- Power Point presentation.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS

Item D

**I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS
Engineering Report by URS,
Jack Waldron**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director of Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Engineering Report by URS, Jack Waldron

Background

An up-to-date status reports on the work to date will be presented. This report covers the engineering aspect of the project. The EIR/EIS has been underway for about two and a half years of a baseline schedule of 43 months. The current schedule will be discussed along with a 3-month look ahead for each of these aspects of the work program. The project is well into the environmental analysis phase of the work program.

Attachment

- Power Point presentation.

Recommended Actions

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS
Item E

**I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS
Environmental Report by LSA,
Rob McCann**

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Environmental Report by LSA, Rob McCann

Background

An Up-to-date status reports on the work to date will be presented. This status report covers the environmental aspect of the project. The EIR/EIS has been underway for about two and a half years of a baseline schedule of 43 months. The schedule will also be discussed along with a 3-month look ahead for each of these aspects of the work program. The project is well into the environmental analysis phase of the work program.

Attachment

- Power Point presentation.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS

Item F

I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Community Participation Report by MIG, Pat McLaughlin

I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Community Participation Report by MIG,
Pat McLaughlin

Background

The I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS includes a comprehensive community involvement approach. Through a strategically crafted community participation framework the I-710 project team provides opportunities for local and corridor-wide stakeholders to provide input throughout the EIR/EIS process.

Attachment

- A status update of public involvement efforts since the previous Project Committee meeting in Power Point format.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report and/or give directions to staff.

VII. REPORTS

Item G

**I-710 Corridor Project Changes and
Revision to Scope of Work -
Presentation by MTA, Doug Failing**

TO: I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS Project Committee

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director, Gateway Cities COG

BY: Project Team Representatives and Consultants

SUBJECT: I-710 Corridor Project Changes and Revision to Scope of Work -
Presentation by MTA, Doug Failing

Background

The I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS has been underway for about two and a half years progressing through a baseline schedule of 43 months. The consultant team has developed a design for each of the project alternatives being evaluated in the EIR/EIS. These designs are commonly referred to as the “initial geometrics”. The consultant team has completed the first internal draft of the EIR/EIS based on these “initial geometrics” and is currently addressing the comments received during the agency review.

Issue

The project team has identified a series of project changes, including changes to the “initial geometrics” that would address stakeholder concerns raised so far through the community participation process. The following is a description of the major changes identified to date by the project team.

Proposed/Requested Revisions to Project Alternatives

Freight Corridor Carrying Capacity

The Freight Corridor is proposed as a limited access facility with a highly controlled traffic flow. The modeling to determine the number of heavy-duty trucks forecasted for the I-710 Corridor increased over 50% from previous estimates (I-710 Major Corridor Study). Because the traffic forecast was prepared with the assumption that each lane in the Freight Corridor would have the same carrying capacity as a regular general purpose freeway lane, the results underestimated the amount of trucks that could potentially use the Freight Corridor. A significant amount of trucks were forecasted to use the general purpose lanes. The project team, with Funding Partner agency review, and in consultation with other regulatory agencies, has determined that in order to more accurately represent and analyze future traffic conditions, the traffic forecast for Alternative 6A/B must be revised with higher carrying capacity assumptions.

North End Geometrics

An alternative design for the northern portion of the I-710 project (from Slauson to the I-5 Interchange) is being proposed. There are a number of considerations that justify the alternative design:

1. *Traffic Projections* - At the end of the 2009, final traffic projections were finalized for the I-710 project. These projections showed that the truck volume projections at the north end of the project were much higher than previously estimated (with more destinations than just the rail yards). The proposed freight corridor has truck ramps that primarily serve the two rail yards. The higher truck volume projections indicated that additional ramps from the freight corridor were warranted to serve the various other destinations and to improve traffic operations at this segment.
2. *Potential BNSF Yard Reconfiguration* - Toward the end of 2009, conceptual plans were obtained from BNSF that showed a proposed reconfiguration of their existing gate along Sheila Ave. and the intent to acquire additional properties along Sheila Ave. The proposed changes would result in the reconfiguration of the rail yard access patterns and this, in turn, would require the redesign of the freight corridor ramps to effectively serve the truck trips coming to and from the two rail yards. The project team will need to discuss any potential changes to the rail yard configuration with BNSF to determine what is the most effective design for the freight corridor.
3. *Washington Blvd. Interchange* - Under the current design, a full service interchange would not be maintained at Washington Blvd. Some of the interchange ramps would be relocated and the remaining ramps will be closed to improve freeway traffic operations in the vicinity of the I-5 Interchange. Numerous conceptual designs completed in 2008 and 2009 indicated that keeping the interchange open at its current location could not be accomplished without impacts to adjacent residential properties. Minimizing residential property impacts is a primary objective of the Project.

The existing interchange ramp serves the industrial, commercial, and residential portions of the community various users in the City of Commerce. However, none of the conceptual designs developed by the end of 2009 could keep the ramps open in both directions without impacting adjacent residential neighborhoods. With this understanding, the City of Commerce gave direction to keep this interchange and its ramps at their current location. The City requested that a new design at the Washington Blvd./I-710 interchange be developed, with an acknowledgment that maintaining the interchange open could involve impacts to the Ayers Neighborhood (and possibly other residences along I-710 west of the freeway at the I-5 interchange).

All of the preceding factors have led to a “re-design” for the freeway and interchanges at the north end of the project. After the City of Commerce’s request, another conceptual

**I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee Agenda
July 29, 2010**

design was developed that does appear to address all the various issues outlined above, but does impact residences. Based on this preliminary analysis, the City of Commerce has requested that this alternative be first evaluated against detailed traffic projections to determine its effectiveness along with more detailed engineering analyses and, if determined effective, be incorporated in the I-710 EIR/EIS for full environmental analysis, along with the previous design. The City held a meeting with community members of the Ayers Neighborhood to explain the project change and possible new design and to express a commitment to involve the community in its development.

Patata Street Freight Corridor on/off Ramp option

Under the current design for Alternative 6A/B, a truck-only connection to and from Miller Way is provided in the City of South Gate. The City has expressed their preference for an alternative connection at Patata Street, just north of Firestone Boulevard because of property impacts of the current design, conflicts with nearby residents, and better circulation. The alternative Freight Corridor connection would involve widening and extending Patata Street across the Los Angeles River and the I-710 to Garfield Avenue, through the use of existing UPRR right-of-way.

The new connection would then connect the truck-only on and off ramps to the new Patata Street to provide trucks access to various warehouses and distribution centers located in the vicinity of South Gate.

The project team has prepared a preliminary layout for the Patata Street Overcrossing and Freight Corridor connection. In order to proceed with the design of this alternative Freight Corridor connection, Metro and Caltrans, in conjunction with the City of South Gate, will need to approach UPRR to initiate discussions on the use of the ROW. If UPRR is amenable to this idea, the project team will refine the design and replace the Miller Way truck-only connection with a connection to Patata Street.

Other Proposed/Requested Revisions

I-5/I-710 Interchange

Caltrans, at the direction of the I-5 JPA, is preparing an EIR/EIS for I-5 between I-605 and I-710, including the I-5/I-710 interchange. The results of that effort, specifically related to the I-5/I-710 interchange, are to be included in the I-710 EIR/EIS. The Caltrans schedule for providing this information has been extended and the information will not be available within the current timeframe for the release of the draft I-710 EIR/EIS. This will result in an extension of the I-710 EIR/EIS schedule and additional coordination costs.

Utility Relocation Strategies

The project team has been working with Southern California Edison (SCE) and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) since the project inception to explore and develop relocation strategies and joint utilization of the high-voltage electrical

transmission facilities right-of-way that currently parallels the freeway for the freight corridor. The relocation strategies developed by the project team did not achieve the goals of the utility companies based on the direction provided by them in the beginning of 2010. To address their concerns about impacts to utilities, a new design may be needed that involves reconfiguring the Los Angeles River levee to relocate the electrical towers. This effort will therefore also include close coordination and review by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The project team will continue to work closely with each utility company and the USACE to develop a relocation strategy that is satisfactory to all parties. Once a strategy is defined, the project team will refine the design and incorporate this change into the I-710 geometric layout. If a satisfactory relocation strategy is not achieved, a new design for the freight corridor might be necessary. This could cause a greater extension in the project schedule.

Tolling Option

The MTA is studying the feasibility of developing public-private-partnerships to fund various transportation projects in Los Angeles County, including the I-710 Corridor Project. The results of this study will help MTA determine if an additional "Build" alternative that includes the use of tolling will need to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Adding this additional alternative to the EIR/EIS would require additional resources and would also affect the project schedule.

Scope Revisions

Incorporating all of the above changes will require not only revisions to the geometric design itself, but also to all the technical studies (both engineering and environmental) that constitute the basis of the EIR/EIS. The project team will work with the City of Commerce and City of South Gate to develop a design that achieves the needs of both communities and provides satisfactory traffic operations. Similarly, the project team, in conjunction with SCE, DWP, and the USACE, will develop new relocation strategies for the two major electrical transmission facilities that parallel the freeway. The revised Alternative 6A/B design would incorporate not only the geometric changes, but also the revised freight corridor capacity assumptions. Because these are significant modifications, their implementation will increase the current scope of the project and extend the schedule. As a result of the schedule extension, additional community participation support will also be required.

Budget and Schedule Implications

The scope revisions summarized above will impact the project's budget and schedule. The project team has determined that the release of the Draft EIR/EIS could be delayed up to 11 months to accommodate all the proposed changes. The preliminary cost of implementing the proposed changes is estimated at approximately \$3.85 million. The final cost will be subject to negotiations with the contractors. The cost of these changes exceeds the project's contingency and will require additional funding. Furthermore, MTA Board authorization will be required to approve the changes and to add additional funding to the project.

Attachment

- Preliminary Scope Change Cost Estimate.

Recommended Action

1. Receive and File Status Reports;
2. Concur with I-710 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendations for modification of scope of work and schedule and associated budget modifications;
3. Forward to the Executive Committee for concurrence and recommendation to MTA Board of Directors to modify the consultant contracts accordingly.

Attachment A - Preliminary Scope Change Cost Estimate

Project Change	Project Elements subject to revision	Estimated Cost¹
1) Revisions to Project Alternatives		
a) FC Capacity changes	AQ/HRA, Traffic Operations Analysis, Traffic Impact Analysis, and other engineering and environmental technical reports (excluding revisions to geometrics) – for two alternatives	\$800,000
b) Patata Option	Geometrics and other technical reports	\$300,000
c) North End Geometry	Geometrics and other technical reports	\$1,300,000
Subtotal for Project Alt. Revisions		\$2,400,000
2) I-5/I-710 Interchange	Additional Project Coordination and Support	\$200,000
3) Utility Relocation Strategies	Geometrics and other technical reports	\$500,000
4) Tolling Option	AQ/HRA, Traffic Operations Analysis, Traffic Impact Analysis, and other engineering and environmental technical reports (excluding revisions to geometrics) – for one alternative	\$400,000
5) Additional Community Participation Support	Community participation required to support the extended schedule.	\$350,000
Total		\$3,850,000

Notes:

1. These represent order of magnitude estimates and are intended for discussion purposes only. The final cost of the proposed changes will be determined based on negotiations between Metro and the contractors.